

Planning and Highways Meeting

Tuesday 3rd March 2026

Trinity Centre

6pm

PRESENT:

Cllrs: D. Allan, L. Allen, Briggs (Chairman), Cooper, Millichope, Parmar, Perks and S. Ward

IN ATTENDANCE:

Olive O'Sullivan	(OOS)	Chief Executive Officer,
Jon Lord	(JL)	Head of Regeneration and Sustainability
Natalia Gorman	(NG)	Project Manager Communications and Events.

There was one member of the public present.

The CEO reported that, in advance of the meeting, two residents had requested that the Royal Sutton Coldfield Town Council Tree Policy referenced The Network Rail Vegetation Management Review (2018) and in particular ensuring Network Rail manages its lineside estate to minimise the amount of vegetation, including tree removal across the town.

100 Apologies for Absence

OOS reported apologies from Cllrs Hatton and Roberts

Resolved to accept the apologies.

101 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Parmar declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 108 advising that his wife is an employee of Severn Trent. Cllr Millichope declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 112 as an employee of University of Birmingham NHS Foundation.

102 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of Planning and Highways Committee held on 3rd February 2026 be signed as a true record.

103 Matters Arising

None.

104 Questions from Members

None.

105 Petition

Committee wished to place on record that there is misinformation in the Petition in relation to the reference that Sutton Coldfield Town Council had received an investment of £20million for the Sutton Gateway Scheme, to be spent on active travel. This information is incorrect, monies secured for the Sutton Gateway is managed by West Midlands Combined Authority. Moreover, JL confirmed that the location for the project proposed in the petition is outside of the scope of the Gateway scheme.

Committee resolved that the petition be forwarded to Birmingham City Council (BCC) for consideration as the Highways Authority; noting it has been raised at the Town Council.

106 Petition

Committee noted that the Petition had been sent to BCC for consideration.

107 Response to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The Chairman commended and thanked JL for his report.

JL explained that the NPPF sets out the government planning policies for England and how they should be applied. It must be taken into account in preparing local development plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions, including planning applications and appeals. The government's current consultation proposes a substantial revision to the NPPF in the context of supporting the government's growth agenda. This includes promoting a more permissive approach to Green Belt development, establishing in principle support for higher density development in urban areas and around stations, whilst still emphasising the need for viable town centres.

In this context, JL outlined the suggested responses to the proposed revisions which are aligned with the Town Council's position on Green Belt development, town centre regeneration, development around stations and delivery of sustainable transport

The Chairman asked how would the NPPF be used in the context of planning applications in Sutton Coldfield in particular those located in the Green Belt.

JL advised that the Development Plan retains its primacy, but the NPPF represents the government's policies for plan-making and for making decisions on development proposals in England and it is a material consideration of critical importance in both contexts. This reinforces the importance of the NPPF as it will be used to determine planning applications and appeals and is already being referenced by applicants to justify their proposals. In addition, JL advised that if there isn't an up to date development plan in place, the NPPF could take preference when assessing proposals which reinforces the need to ensure its policies are appropriate and deliver the town council's aspirations for the town in regards locating future development and protecting the green belt.

Given that the Town Council has objected to BCC's Green Belt Assessment and its approach to identify potential grey belt around the town, the Chairman queried if the NPPF, as worded, helps our position.

JL clarified that the NPPF as worded actually could make it easier for grey belt to be identified and developed adding that within the BCC Local Plan there is a gap between the identification of potential grey belt and how this will be taken forward. JL stated that there is a gap within the current plan which applicants could exploit with speculative development in these locations. This could be exacerbated by BCC potentially not having an up to date development plan in place then we could be faced with the NPPF taking precedent locally and a Green Belt assessment which identifies locations as potential grey belt.

Cllr Millichope asked if Birmingham City Council will submit a response to the NPPF consultation. JL understands that this is the intention

Cllr Ward thanked JL for this comprehensive report. Cllr Ward expressed his worry for the potential for development to take place on Green Belt land and wants to avoid any loopholes being used by decision makers to approve development on grey belt areas across the town and the subsequent harmful impact on Sutton Coldfield's Green Belt areas.

Resolved that Committee approves that the Town Council responds to the NPPF consultation on the basis set out in section 5 of [this report](#).

113 Review of Birmingham City Council's Green Belt Assessment

JL outlined the purpose of the Report, which is to seek Committee's approval to commissioning consultants to undertake an appraisal of Birmingham City Council's Green Belt Assessment. JL explained that Committee, at its December meeting, endorsed the suggested response to BCC's Birmingham Local Plan Focussed Preferred Options document. This response raised concerns about the robustness of the assessment undertaken by the Green Belt Assessment in relation to how areas identified as potential grey belt had been identified.

In endorsing the response, Committee had requested that Town Council Officers obtain costings from consultants to carry out a more detailed assessment of the outcomes of the Green Belt Assessment. Since then officers had developed a further understanding of the approach to the Green Belt Assessment which will inform the brief for a consultant to produce this piece of work.

JL explained that in the context of the NPPF revisions outlined previously, alongside uncertainty regarding the timeframe for the publication of the next stage of the Birmingham Local Plan, progressing this piece of work is of particular importance. The primary aim is to have the outcome to inform the next consultation stage of the Birmingham Local Plan.

Resolved that Committee approves the request set out in the Report for Town Council Officers to commission consultants to undertake the appraisal.

108 Grand Union Canal Transfer – Launch of Phase Two Public Consultation

JL advised that the Town Council had been consulted on the second phase of the public consultation on the proposal to utilise the Grand Union Canal bring treated water from the

Midlands to the Southeast. It is a joint water transfer project between two water companies, Severn Trent and Affinity Water, and the Canal & River Trust (the Trust) charity, who are the owner and navigation authority of the canals in England and Wales.

Resolved to respond to the consultation as follows:

On the basis that any direct impacts on the Town result from the proposed new Advanced Water Treatment Plant at the existing Minworth Waste and Water Recycling Centre, the Town Council is seeking assurance that any impacts relating to both its construction and operation are mitigated appropriately.

The Town Council expects the proposer to produce and publish a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) which sets out mitigation measures, monitoring and measurement (including thresholds for noise, hours of construction), construction method statements, incident response, complaints and contact processes and this is reviewed regularly through the construction process.

Furthermore, the Town Council would expect the proposer to produce and publish an Operational Impacts Mitigation Plan to clearly set out how the operation will be measured and the thresholds for noise, odour, dust etc. and the processes that stakeholders can use to hold the operators of the facility to account should the thresholds, such as noise, be exceeded.

109 Royal Sutton Coldfield Town Council Tree Policy

OOS outlined the approach of the policy which is intended to protect trees and the wider environment in Royal Sutton Coldfield. It also aims to increase canopy cover, by planting more trees that improve diversity and reliance; and ensure that when trees are removed through development, the maximum compensation is secured.

Committee questioned how the Town Council could influence planning policies in relation to minimising the amount of trees lost for development whilst setting appropriate thresholds for tree and vegetation replacement. JL stated that BCC already has specific planning policies covering these issues, but the next consultation stage of the Birmingham Plan could allow the opportunity for the Town Council to promote a specific approach for the Town.

In relation to influencing other landowners to protect trees located on their land, Committee agreed with the suggestion made by two residents, and set out in their questions to Committee, that the Tree Policy makes reference to The Network Rail Vegetation Management Review (2018) and in particular ensuring Network Rail manages its lineside estate to minimise the amount of vegetation, including tree removal across the town.

Resolved that Committee recommended the proposed [Tree Policy](#), which includes a reference to The Network Rail Vegetation Management Review (2018), to Full Council for approval.

110 Replacement Litter Bins

OOS advised Committee that the Town Council had received resident representation from park users of Withy Hill requesting the replacement of bins which are coming to the end of their economic life.

Cllr Parmar stated that residents have also contacted him regarding the current state of bins at this location.

In addition, six bins at New Hall Valley Country Park have reached the end of the economic life and park users have requested that the Town Council consider their replacement.

Resolved to: recommend to Full Council that an allocation of £8,004.27 be approved from the Roughley Community Infrastructure Levy towards the cost of installing ten replacement litter bins at Withy Hill Park.

Resolved to: approve an allocation of £5,494 towards the cost of installing the sixteen replacement litter bins at Withy Hill and New Hall Valley Country Park, to be funded from the Street Furniture & Litter Bin and Clean & Green Improvements Budgets.

111 Pre-App Consultation re New Mobile Broadband Base Station within the Car Park of Walmley Social Club, Fox Hollies Road, Sutton Coldfield B76 2RL

Cllr Perks expressed his disappointment that the roof of Walmley Social Club was not chosen as the proposed location for the new mobile broadband base station given that telecommunication equipment is already in place there, and noted that this does not accord with the Town Council's Planning Principles regarding the siting of new telecommunication equipment

Committee also raised concerns regarding the potential impacts on adjacent trees, including those located in the adjacent ancient woodland, which could arise from telecommunication equipment being sited on the car park.

Resolved to submit the following response to Causeway Telecoms Planning:

The Town Council would not support the installation of the proposal at this location and consider its installation would adversely impact on nearby trees; particularly those located in the adjacent designated ancient woodland.

Notwithstanding the accepted need for this kind of infrastructure, the Town Council's preference is that location D1, of your options assessment is the most appropriate location for your proposal. This aligns with the Town Council's Planning Principle for assessing proposals for new telecommunication equipment as reproduced below:

An expectation that proposals for new telecommunication equipment demonstrate a sequential approach to their location based on the Town Council's preference e.g. that new proposals are prioritised within existing telecommunication infrastructure, followed by the roof of existing buildings and lastly, where it can be demonstrated that the former are unsuitable, locations of new equipment should not result in any significant adverse visual or environmental impacts.

This response is given without prejudice to the Town Council's formal consideration of any subsequent application.

112 Planning Application [2026/00268/PA](#) : Good Hope Hospital, Rectory Road Sutton Coldfield

The Chairman reminded Committee that this item had been deferred from the February meeting, following the receipt of an extension from BCC to submit comments.

Committee resolve to submit the following to BCC:

The Town Council fully supports the provision of a new Urgent Treatment Centre (UTC) at Good Hope Hospital and welcomes the services offered and the associated positive healthcare impacts for the town's residents. Moreover, the design of the proposed building which includes cladding panels of a terracotta/ bronze results in a much more attractive, and higher quality, design and finish than the adjoining buildings, and is therefore welcomed.

Unfortunately, in order to accommodate the associated realigned access road and the relocated ambulance parking, the proposals seek to remove 37 mature trees which currently obscure views to both Cemetery Road and potentially of the graveyard beyond. Whilst the hospital grounds are very large, and there clearly are areas of surface parking where this new building could have been proposed and have had no effect on existing planting, it is assumed that the location had been chosen on the basis of it being co-located with the existing Emergency Department (ED) to triage patients to appropriate treatment areas, both within the hospital and to other off-site locations.

The Proposed Habitat Plan which accompanies the application identifies where the trees will be lost with almost the entirety of those in the northwestern section of the site boundary adjoining Cemetery Road appearing to be proposed for removal. In terms of mitigation, the plan states there will be a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 21.38% achieved by enhancing the remaining grass and woodland. The woodland will be enhanced by removing invasive shrubs, such as rhododendron, then replacing the grass with a better mix and retaining any cut-down timber to create new habitat. It could be questioned whether the removal of so many trees can be compensated by improving the grass mixture and low-level planting.

The Town Council therefore requests the Trust considers opportunities to realign the access road and associated ambulance parking to eliminate the need for such extensive tree removal. If the Trust demonstrates this is not possible, the Town Council would expect an element of re-planting of appropriate trees to be proposed either within the hospital site or, if this is not possible, off site to mitigate the loss of the mature trees.

Furthermore, noting that the University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust is planning additional parking but it is not committed yet and is not part of this application, the Town Council is concerned about the potential parking impacts arising from the proposal. Whilst the Trust, as the applicant, argues that the proposal will generate minimal additional car based trips on the basis of it both forming an extension or add-on to an existing established ED, given the pressures on the NHS it may be unrealistic to assume that the ED won't remain as busy as it is now. Therefore, the opening of the UTC could result in

additional trips to the hospital on the basis of more people choosing Good Hope on the basis of it having a UTC compared to alternative options.

On this basis, and to allow for a more robust assessment of traffic impacts, it would be helpful for the applicant to provide additional information on how many new patients are expected to visit the site on a daily basis, rather than just the vehicle numbers referenced in the accompanying Transport Assessment. In addition, it would be helpful to know when 'peak parking' utilisation is at the hospital as there does not seem to be any parking survey results provided in the assessment.

Subsequently, additional information on anticipated patient numbers for the UTC and a parking survey should be provided prior to the application being determined to ensure a robust assessment of the parking impacts of the proposal is undertaken.

At 19:45 Committee took resolution to extend meeting for up to one hour.

114 Planning Applications

(i) Schedules of Planning Applications for Sutton Coldfield Town Council Area registered between 3rd February - 26th March 2026

Four Oaks Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00701/PA	41 All Saints Drive Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4AG Application to determine the details for condition 3 (sample materials) attached to planning approval 2025/06510/PA	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00973/PA	3 Streetly Drive Birmingham B74 4PY Erection of 6 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3 metres, eaves height 3 metres	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00474/PA	28 Streetly Lane Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4TU Erection of two storey front extension and bay window to ground floor front with dormer window to front	<u>No Objection</u>

2026/00319/PA	51 Clarence Road Sutton Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4AQ Erection of single storey rear extension with align patio and first floor side extension with associated roof extension	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00433/PA	17 Kesterton Road Birmingham B74 4JP Installation of ramped access to front elevation	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00281/PA	22 Clarence Road Birmingham B74 4AE Erection of hip to gable roof extension to side, dormer window to rear with Juliet balcony and rooflights to front	Objection: Committee is of the opinion that the excessive size of the proposed rear dormer would result in an incongruous feature whilst the addition of a juliette balcony could potentially overlook adjacent residential properties and impact on the amenity of neighbours.
2026/00265/PA	1 Bennett Drive Birmingham B74 4BF Demolition of existing detached garage, erection of two storey side and single storey side extensions	<u>No Objection</u>

<p>2026/00135/PA</p>	<p>19 Ladywood Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2SW</p> <p>Erection of first floor accommodation including the erection of dormer windows to rear and side elevations, rooflights to front and side elevations, internal alterations including new staircase and doors and the erection of a single storey rear extension with associated landscaping works including new solar panels</p>	<p><u>Objection:</u></p>
--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------

This appears to be the third application that has been made concerning this property, with one from 2025 recently approved. This established the principles of converting virtually all of the roofspace to accommodation (with a host of individual dormers added to the existing roofs), adding a staircase into a central space to serve them, and creating new ground-floor kitchen, dining and sitting areas at the rear through a combination of converting one room and adding two in a modern, predominantly glass, style.

The Design & Access Statement accompanying the application is very difficult to interpret. It appears this application moves the stair to a side room; alters the new sitting room to make it larger, whilst avoiding the existing swimming pool by placing it closer to the existing building; and converts much less of the roof space and therefore proposes fewer dormer windows. Despite the huge amount of information provided about the proposals, it is not organised or coordinated to make it simple to understand exactly what is being proposed and where. Although it has been much reduced in size after the fire, this is still a grand house, and therefore it is considered that the proposed new location for the main first-floor access stair is too secondary and low key. The previous central version was more akin to the original location, and seemed more appropriate.

Using a distinctive and modern style for an addition to a Listed Building is generally accepted, and this seems appropriate for the new rear extensions. However, the applicant has chosen to use a very traditional form for the dormers, yet they then clad them in vibrant copper shingles and appear to use black aluminium window frames. As all of the existing original windows have iron frames and leaded lights, and with a heritage statement which reproduces the listing mentioning the lattice windows, this seems to be an uncomfortable halfway house and should be removed. They also appear to be suggesting white framed windows in some places. The photo on p29 of the Heritage Statement, which shows the existing rear of the house, illustrates how inconsistent, and unsympathetic, white-framed windows would be to this historic building.

The proposal is therefore considered not to comply with 3.5 (b & c) of the Birmingham Four Oaks Estate Development Guidelines SPD (1993) whilst not complying with BCC's Design Guide SPD in particular: Design Principles 2 (Character Assessment), and Design Principles 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality).

	10A Ladywood Road Sutton Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2SN	
	Erection of two storey rear extension, loft conversion with associated rooflights to side and rear elevations, internal reconfiguration and alterations to front elevation.	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00114/PA	60 Streetly Lane Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4TA	
	Erection of a replacement single storey rear extension, and erection of front boundary gates and railings.	<u>No Objection</u>

2025/06690/PA	<p>88 Rosemary Hill Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4HH</p> <p>Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a new two-storey dwellinghouse (Use Class C3), new front boundary wall and gate, detached garage and garden room</p>	<u>Objection:</u>
<p>The Design & Access Statement supporting the application states that the new house is to be in a “similar position” to the existing one, but a key change is that it will project farther forward and vary from the fairly consistent front line of its predecessor and the adjoining properties, notwithstanding the claim in the statement that there is a varied front line. The size of the rooms on the plans is generous, so it should be possible to remove 1.5m off the building front to reduce its projection and consequently reduce its impact.</p> <p>The proposed siting of a large, garage near the main road is rare in this area and will both place a utilitarian wall facing the public highway, obscuring much of the main building and will be unduly prominent feature on the street scene. Despite it being very visible from the street, the garage seems to have very little architectural merit. It is surprising that no details are given of the appearance of the proposed new front-garden boundary despite it being part of the application description and there are no elevations or details of the proposed perimeter treatment to the main road.</p> <p>The accompanying report states that there will be around a 17% biodiversity nett loss, but, although possibilities are mentioned, there is no statement of how they will actually achieve the required 10% nett gain. The application is therefore considered to not comply with BCC’s Design Guide SPD in particular: Design Principles 2 (Character Assessment), Design Principles 3, as it fails to positively acknowledge and enhance the urban realm and Design Principle 13 as the proposal would negatively impact on the amenity of surrounding properties, whilst considered contrary to 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality).</p>		

Mere Green Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00327/PA	<p>184 Clarence Road Sutton Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4LD</p> <p>Erection of first floor rear, side and front extension, with julliet balcony and no.2 roof lights to rear.</p>	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/06892/PA	<p>126-128 Mere Green Road Sutton Coldfield B75 5DA</p> <p>Installation of new driveway and foot path crossing</p>	<u>No Objection</u>

2025/06867/PA	Springhill Farm Camp Road Sutton Coldfield Staffordshire B75 5QY Change of use of existing buildings to day nursery and associated offices	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00705/PA	229 Lichfield Road Sutton Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 2XB Erection of single storey rear extension.	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/06852/PA	Land on the South Side of Hillwood Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5QW Erection of 2no. dwellings with associated parking, access, hard and soft landscaping and habitat creation area	<u>Objection:</u>
<p>The site lies within the existing Green Belt any amendment to the boundaries of which should be considered in the context of the Birmingham Local Plan Review. As such the proposed development, for which it is acknowledged that there is no overriding housing need, would be contrary to existing adopted planning policies and inappropriate in this location.</p> <p>The proposed development would encroach into the countryside resulting in a loss of openness which would be detrimental to the rural character and visual amenity of the area which harm would not be outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The site is some distance from the nearest public transport facilities (approximately 1.5 miles to the nearest railway station at Butlers Lane) and piece-meal development of the kind proposed at this location would not promote sustainable patterns of development and would be contrary to relevant guidance in the NPPF and approved local planning policies.</p>		
2026/00228/PA	16 Bishops Way Birmingham B74 4XU Erection of single storey rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>

Reddicap Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2025/06776/PA	New Hall Hotel Walmley Road Sutton New Hall Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76 1QX Installation of 3no. EV chargers	<u>No Objection</u>

Roughley Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00554/PA	32 Mayall Drive Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5LR Application for a lawful development certificate for proposed alterations to main roof to include a hip to gable roof conversion, associated dormer window to rear and installation of 2.no roof lights to front.	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00511/PA	6 Wayside Drive Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 5UN Application for a lawful development certificate for proposed proposed single storey, rear extension with a flat roof and two lantern rooflights.	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00691/PA	Ivy Cottage Whitehouse Common Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 6EH Application to determine the details for condition numbers 3. (ecological/biodiversity/enhancement measures) and 5. (contamination remediation scheme) attached to planning application reference 2025/02438/PA.	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00449/PA	Greenside, 12B Moor Hall Drive Birmingham B75 6LP Erection of a single storey rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/05767/PA	Land to the rear of 29-33 Withy Hill Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 6HS Erection of a two storey detached dwelling house (Use Class C3) and single storey detached building forming garage and annex and associated parking, landscaping, EV charging point and amenity space	<u>Objection:</u>

The proposed vehicular access to the property is long and narrow and fails to adequately meet the servicing needs of a new dwelling with attendant deliveries etc. Moreover, there would also appear to be a lack of space within the building plot to conveniently turn around. There would also appear to be a degree of resultant overlooking of the gardens of neighbouring properties and would result in an unacceptable visual impact on neighbouring properties.

Moreover, the Town Council is concerned that the loss of existing garages to accommodate the proposal could result in an increase in on-street parking at this location.

The proposal represents an undesirable form of backland development which would be out of keeping and detrimental to the character and amenity of the area contrary to PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan and relevant Design Principles in the Birmingham Design Guide.

Trinity Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00523/PA	<p>Sutton Coldfield Hospital Duke Street Car Park Birmingham Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1QH</p> <p>Application to determine the details for condition number 10 (Submission of a scheme for ecological/biodiversity/enhancement measures) attached to reference number 2024/02000/PA</p>	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/07016/PA	<p>10 Birmingham Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1QG</p> <p>Installation of new shopfront including a new entrance lobby, an external decking area with retractable canopy above together with the installation of an external flue and widening the existing external escape door</p>	<u>No Objection</u>

2025/05928/PA	43-45 South Parade Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1QU Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) attached to Planning Approval 2024/03948/PA to allow for the reconfiguration of the internal layout of the building/flats, along with associated alterations to the fenestration.	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00191/PA	2 Ashdene Close Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 6HL Erection of part single two storey front side and rear extensions including first floor roof terrace	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00330/PA	124 Coles Lane Birmingham B72 1NP Erection of single storey side and rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>

Vesey Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00579/PA	44 Stonehouse Lane Birmingham B73 6LL Erection of single storey side and rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>
2024/07270/PA	48 Morven Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 6ND Installation of footway crossing	<u>No Objection</u>

2026/00760/PA	<p>New Oscott Primary School Markham Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 6QR</p> <p>Application to determine details for conditions number 13 (BREEAM rating), 14 (scheme of ecological/biodiversity/enhancement measures), 16 (landscape and ecological management plan) and 17 (biodiversity roof) attached to planning permission 2023/07676/PA</p>	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00671/PA	<p>117 Westwood Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 6UH</p> <p>Erection of single storey rear extension</p>	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00355/PA	<p>110 Jockey Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5PP</p> <p>Erection of single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension.</p>	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/07147/PA	<p>80-82 Boldmere Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5TJ</p> <p>Replacement of the existing shopfront, access door and serving hatch to Boldmere Road elevation, construction of new step/ramped approach with handrail and dwarf wall, installation of new external louvres to rear elevation , construction of new external bin store area, construction of new close boarded yard gates and fence and relocation of roof condensers</p>	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00601/PA	<p>344 Chester Road Birmingham B73 5BU</p> <p>Erection of 8 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3.9 metres, eaves height 2.9 metres</p>	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00541/PA	<p>44 Stonehouse Road Birmingham B73 6LL</p> <p>Erection of 8 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3 metres, eaves height 2.8 metres</p>	<u>No Objection</u>

2025/07059/PA	<p>1 A Coppice View Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 6UE</p> <p>Change of use of the dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a children care home (Use Class C2) for up to 2no children</p>	<u>Objection:</u>
<p>The proposal would result in a loss of a 4-bedroom family home, which BCC's Housing Needs Assessment indicates are in high demand, and could also set a precedent for other changes of uses which would consequently alter the character of the area and make it potentially less balanced and sustainable.</p> <p>The proposal is therefore considered contrary to sub-sections a & e of Policy DM12 (Residential conversions and specialist accommodation) of the Development Management in Birmingham DPD. It is also contrary to the Town Council's Planning & Highways Committee adopted Planning Principle which states that Committee would not ordinarily support the conversion of dwelling houses, in particular larger family homes, into non-residential uses.</p>		

Walmley & Minworth Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2025/07021/PA	<p>Peddimore (Unit B, Development Zone 1A) Land north of Minworth, land predominantly east of the A38 and west of Wiggins Hill Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76</p> <p>Variation of Condition 2 (Plans) of reserved matters permission 2023/08637/PA to amend the number of loading bays from 31no. to 28no. along with associated alterations to the walkway, ramp and sally port metal cage in the service yard</p>	<u>No Objection</u>

2026/00659/PA	67 Springfield Crescent Birmingham B76 2ST Erection of 3.2 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 3.75 metres, eaves height 2.7 metres	<u>No Objection</u>
-------------------------------	--	---------------------

Wylde Green Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00528/PA	111 Holifast Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B72 1AF Application for a lawful development certificate for proposed loft conversion	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/05817/PA	5 Conchar Close Birmingham B72 1LN Erection of 5.3 metre deep single storey rear extension. Maximum height 2.9 metres eaves height 2.5 metres	<u>No Objection</u>
2025/07141/PA	170 Birmingham Road Sutton Vesey Sutton Coldfield B72 1BX Application for a lawful development certificate for an existing use of the premises as a mixed use comprising 5no self-contained flats (Use Class C3) on the ground and first floors and commercial audio production studio (Use Class E(g) (iii) in the basement in excess of 10 years.	<u>No Objection</u>

Resolved to submit comments and objections to Birmingham City Council

(ii) **Additional Planning Applications for Sutton Coldfield Town Council Area
registered between 25th February - 3rd March 2026**

Four Oaks Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00731/PA	63 Walsall Road Four Oaks Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4NH Erection of single storey glazed extension to rear garage.	Whilst Committee have no objection, they respectfully request that a no habitation clause is applied if approved

Mere Green Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00767/PA	42 Meadowside Road Birmingham B74 4SJ Erection of single storey rear extension	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/01086/PA	180 Hill Village Road Birmingham B75 5JG Prior Approval for enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00722/PA	1 Yates Croft Birmingham B74 4YB Erection of first floor side extension	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00482/PA	16 Netherstone Grove Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B74 4DT Installation of rear outbuilding	Whilst Committee have no objection, they respectfully request that a no habitation clause is applied if approved

Roughley Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00656/PA	7 St Andrews Road Birmingham B75 6UG Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear and front extensions	<u>Objection</u>
<p>The two-storey element is proposed at the side of the existing property which is located on the cul-de-sac section of St Andrews Rd. The householder plots are irregular in shape and positioned at an angle to each other.</p> <p>The design of the proposed two storey side extension element is considered rather clumsy in terms of its relationship with the boundary of the property as it would result in the extension being built without an adequate gap being left with the boundary of the adjacent property.</p> <p>It would be incongruous in the context of the existing street scene whilst resulting in an unacceptable visual impact on the neighbouring property. In addition, the single storey extension elements, together with the proposed internal reconfiguration of the property, appears to result in a layout which could be utilised as a separate, independent dwelling which, if confirmed, would not be supported. This requires further clarification prior to determination.</p> <p>The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Design Principles 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality) and 16 (Residential Extensions) of The Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p>		
2026/00465/PA	148 Whitehouse Common Road Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B75 6DP Erection of single storey rear with first floor side extension. Two storey side and single storey front extension.	<u>Objection</u> <p>The design and massing of the proposed two storey side and single front extensions is considered inappropriate in the property's immediate context and would result in an incongruous visual impact on the street scene. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Design Principles 14 (Architectural cohesion and quality) and 16 (Residential Extensions) of The Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p>

Vesey Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00779/PA	381 Chester Road Birmingham B73 5BL Erection of two storey side extension	<u>No Objection</u>

2026/00824/PA	Former Homebase store 75 Chester Road The Royal Town of Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B73 5BA Application to determine the details for condition number 3, 5, 6 and 7 (3-ecological/biodiversity/enhancement measures 5-A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) 6-Submission of hard and/or soft landscape details 7-The Biodiversity Gain Plan) attached to reference number 2025/05250/PAMinor Alterations to the store elevations, service yard and car park, including landscaping. new transformer, sub-station, cycle shelter and trolley storage	<u>No Objection</u>
2026/00658/PA	46 Heathlands Road Birmingham B73 5DZ Erection of single storey side and single storey rear extensions	<u>No Objection</u>

Walmley & Minworth Ward

Application No	Site Address & Development Description	RSCTC Recommendation
2026/00685/PA	34 Cottage Lane Sutton Coldfield Birmingham B76 9AW Application for a lawful development certificate for proposed single storey rear extension and single storey rear outbuilding	<u>No Objection</u>

Resolved to submit comments to Birmingham City Council.

(i) **Schedules of Planning Applications and Decisions Made**

Committee note that there was one applications that had been determined since 3rd February 2026.

(ii) **Schedules of Planning Decisions**

Resolved to note the schedule of decisions and welcomed the recent trend for BCC decisions to reflect Committee's submissions

115 Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 31st March 2026, 6pm at The Trinity Centre.

Meeting closed 20:00

Signed:

Date:

DRAFT